

I-70 Traffic and Revenue Study  
Project Leadership Team (PLT) Meeting #4  
Meeting Minutes  
August 21, 2013  
Idaho Springs, CO – Elks Lodge

Handouts for the meeting included:

Agenda

Core Values, Critical Issues, and Critical Success Factors Table for Review and Ratification

## Welcome and Opening

Wendy Wallach (Parsons) opened the Project Leadership Team's (PLT) fourth meeting with welcoming remarks and a request for self-introductions. Wendy briefly went over the agenda for the meeting.

## Agenda Item 1 – Ratification of Core Values, Critical Issues and Critical Success Factors

Wendy stated that main objective is to review and make any final changes to the Critical Success Factors (CSF) so that we can move forward and so the PLT can begin to develop the initial performance measures. These performance measures will be reviewed by the Project Leadership Team (PLT) and vetted with the Technical Team. Wendy proceeded with reviewing each Core Value, the corresponding Critical Issues, and reviewing the Critical Success Factors that were formulated at the June 26, 2013 meeting. Revisions to the Critical Success Factors are listed as follows:

1. Safety – Revise “Provide reliable access for emergency responders...” and replace with “Provide reliable access **and protection** for responders...”
2. Mobility - Revise “adds value to existing lanes, incident response access ...” and replace with “**efficiently manages slow moving vehicles, provides** incident response access...”

Discussion: Cindy Neely (Clear Creek County) concerned that slow moving vehicles is not called out specifically in the Critical Success Factor (CSF) and is only included in a general sense. Elena Wilken (CASTA) asked a question - what does “adds value to existing lanes?” mean. Ralph Trapani (Parsons) – commented that adds value could mean efficiency and Dick Bauman (CDOT) commented that the benefit of no capacity increase would add value to the existing lanes. The PLT suggested to make change to CSF to incorporate change regarding efficiently manages slow moving vehicles and adding the word “provides” before incident response.

3. Constructability – No changes.
4. Engineering Criteria and Aesthetic Guidelines – Revise “...engineering standards and are inspired by the natural surroundings...”, and replace with “...engineering standards and are **compatible with** the natural surroundings.”

Discussion: Cindy Neely (Clear Creek County) expressed concern that the project establishes financial feasibility using an example of not measuring financial feasibility based on “1 mile of highway in Kansas” when the reality is that a mile in this corridor is much more costly. Ralph Trapani (Parsons) replied saying that a tension is created between cost and

“protection” and sees it as being a balance. Protection of the environment is called out in both the Critical Issues and incorporated into the Critical Success Factors.

Performance measures are going to be critical. There won't be a “weighting” of the issues, but there needs to be agreement on the process and performance measurements to do the analysis. Phil Buckland (Clear Creek) talked about standards used now may not be acceptable in the future. He doesn't want a design “out of a book” versus what should be considered for the Mountain corridor. Wendy Wallach (Parsons) stated that the project is following the guidelines, but there may be some variance in design and aesthetics. She feels confident following the I-70 CSS guidelines; we can determine the best solution.

5. Sustainability – Revise “...preserve the natural surroundings and limit the use...” replace with “**preserve** the natural surroundings and minimize the use...”
6. Decision Making Process –Revise “...agreement by the public and stakeholders...” replace with “...agreement by the public, **the PLT**, and stakeholders...”

Discussion: Cindy Neely (Clear Creek County) commented regarding feedback from Twin Tunnels. The PLT doesn't take the place of public involvement. The design needs to have a public information process. David Singer (CDOT) commented that the T&R scope does not have a Public Outreach component and the job of the Project Leadership Team is to represent stakeholders. The stakeholders will need to serve as a measure of Public Acceptance. Randy Jensen (FHWA) commented that the public is not the PLT, and the PLT is not the public. The PLT agreed to add “...agreement by the public, **the PLT**, and stakeholders...”

7. Community (Local, Regional, Statewide) – No changes.
8. Historic Context – No changes.
9. Healthy Environment – Revise “...minimize and/or mitigate environmental impacts.” Replace with “...minimize, **enhance**, and/or mitigate environmental impacts.”
10. Fiscal Responsibility - No changes.

Discussion: Jim Bemelen (CDOT) cautioned the PLT that we are not designing this. The cost estimates have allowance. Wendy Wallach (Parsons) stated that the Issue Task Forces will help with the methodology. Question posed will revenues cover cost at conceptual level. Ralph Trapani (Parsons) stated there is a benefit vs. cost exercise included in the Critical Success Factors. Tim Mauck (Clear Creek County) commented on “fiscal responsibility” saying it's 1) what we live with and, 2) design with in context and evaluate liberally to context of community and environment versus scrape for extra values. Jim Bemelen (CDOT) reminded the PLT to consider ALL core values as a whole.

Phil Buckland (Clear Creek County) commented back to the Core Value of Safety and corresponding Critical Success Factor and expressed concern for safety for the emergency responders, not just reliable access. PLT members agreed to make a change to the Safety Critical Success Factor to be revised from “Provide reliable access for emergency responders...” to be replaced with “Provide reliable access **and protection** for emergency responders...”. Phil also expressed concern regarding the standards that will be used. Concerned that standards change and that the project would not run based on what was in the books. Randy Jensen (FHWA) commented on safety in designing and using similar designs relative to other mountain corridors that are interstate.

Wendy Wallach (Parsons) will incorporate all of the noted changes and send out a draft along with the meeting minutes from today. She stated that Louis Berger is on-board and can move forward.

## **Agenda Item 2 – Technical Team**

Wendy Wallach (Parsons) moved into discussion regarding the Technical Team (TT) that is forming and the kick-off meeting that is following the PLT meeting today. Wendy gave an overview of the participants, the roles and responsibilities of the TT, the schedule and critical milestones that the TT will be meeting.

Melinda Urban (FHWA) asked a question on the Powerpoint slide of what NGO stands for. NGO needs to be spelled out as “non-governmental organization” – Wendy to make the change.

## **Agenda Item 3 – Review of June 26, 2013 Meeting Minutes**

Cindy Neely had a correction to the June 26, 2013 Meeting Minutes regarding Agenda Item #7. The third bore tunnel is not addressed in the option.

Wendy Wallach (Parsons) to make the change to the minutes and send out the final version to the PLT.

## **Agenda Item 4 – I-70 Project Updates**

There are no updates at this time.

## **Agenda Item 5 – Next Steps**

There will not be a PLT meeting in September. The focus will be on getting the Technical Team meetings rolling and up to speed. The next PLT meeting in October will discuss initial performance measurements.

Date and location of the next PLT meeting in October is to be determined.